

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 4, 6, 9 and 10 being the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,275 to *Martin et al.* (hereinafter, *Martin*).

Regarding the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1-16, the Examiner contends that each element of Claim 1 is taught or suggested by *Martin*.

Claim 1 recites a method for performing call setup by a mobile station in a mobile communication system having a base station for serving the mobile station, and a mobile switching center for controlling the base station. At least one digit of a recipient's phone number is entered. In response to the entering of the at least one digit of the recipient's phone number, an origination message that does not contain a recipient's phone number is transmitted to the base station. A channel assignment message is received from the base station for forward and reverse traffic channels, and wireless channels to the base station are set up according to assignment information included in the channel assignment message. Entry of the recipient's phone number is completed, and an origination continuation message containing the recipient's phone number is transmitted to the base station, in response to a send key input.

Martin discloses a method for accelerating call establishment in a radio communication system. Instead of waiting for completion of dialing, the terminal immediately sends a channel request message to the network.

Martin describes that the terminal detects when the user picks up the receiver, generates a dial tone, and sends a channel request message to the network immediately after starting to

generate the dial tone. Thus, *Martin* fails to disclose the transmission of an origination message to the base station, in response to the entering of at least one digit of the recipient's phone number, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over *Martin*.

The Examiner also rejected independent Claims 4, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 6, 9 and 10 each recite an origination message generated in response to the entry of at least one digit corresponding to a recipient's phone number. Thus, Claims 6, 9 and 10 contain similar subject matter to that of Claim 1.

Further, Claims 4, 6 and 9 have been amended to recite the requesting of a wire resource when an origination message is received, and the acknowledgement of the wireless resource assignment request message as a message indicating completion of the assignment of the wire resource in the mobile switching center.

In order to solve the problem of time delay in transmitting and receiving the information between the assignment subjects, when the service request message requesting the assignment of the wire resource is transmitted to the mobile switching center and the assignment request message of the wireless resource is received from the mobile switching center, it regards the assignment request message of the corresponding wireless resource as a message indicating the assignment completion of the wire resource in the mobile switching center. The assignment complete message of the wireless resource is transmitted to the mobile switching center, so that the time delay during the call setup procedure is prevented, thereby minimizing the user's inconvenience.

Martin fails to disclose that the assignment subject of the wireless resource is separated from the assignment subject of the wire resource in relation to transmitting and receiving the information between the assignment subjects. More specifically, *Martin* fails to disclose the requesting of the assignment of the wire resource, the assignment request message of the wireless resource, and the assignment complete message of the wireless resource which are

transmitted and received between the base station and the mobile switching center of the present invention. In view of the above, Claims 4, 6, 9 and 10 are also patentable over *Martin*.

Regarding Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 11-16, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 11-16 are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claims 1-16 are allowable over *Martin*, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens III
Registration No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicant(s)

The Farrell Law Firm, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565